



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,027	03/16/2001	Ivan A. Bachelder	C00-022	5587
23459	7590	11/24/2004	EXAMINER	
ARTHUR J. O'DEA LEGAL DEPARTMENT COGNEX CORPORATION ONE VISION DRIVE NATICK, MA 01760-2077			STREGE, JOHN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,027

Applicant(s)

BACHELDER ET AL.

Examiner

John B Strege

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Response to Amendment/Arguments

The amendments received 10/27/04 have been received and all requested changes have been entered.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argue that Burns teaches away from using geometric models in column 3 lines 24-30 and other parts of columns 2. However this is part of the background of the invention and Burns merely states that there is a need for improvement with the prior method of using indistinct features such as line junctions or elliptical arcs, but does not exclude or teach away from using geometric models. On the contrary Burns proposes an improvement to the well-known use of geometric models thus providing motivation that it would be obvious to use line junctions or elliptical arcs. Specifically Burns states that the "encoding generally provides significantly more detailed information about image features than, for example, mere line junctions, elliptical arcs or edge points, for example" (col. 6 lines 23-26). By the use of the word "mere" it is interpreted that the image features could also include line junctions, elliptical arcs or edge points in addition to the improvements suggested by Burns. Furthermore as seen in figure 4a-4c and figure 5, the patches are two-dimensional.

Applicants' further argue that Burns and Eibert are not combinable based on the argument that Burns teaches away from using geometrical models, however as the examiner has addressed that Burns does not teach away this argument is therefore moot.

Art Unit: 2625

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, refinement of a model is within the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art of image processing comparing images to identify an object. Furthermore Eibert discloses that the invention provides a reliable system for object measurement, position and attitude determination, and object classification (col. 1 lines 38-44).

Regarding claim 5, Applicants' argue that Eibert nor Burns disclose, "determining the dimension of said part of said object." Eibert discloses providing for object measurement, position, and attitude determination (col. 1 lines 41-43). Furthermore Burns discloses providing sufficient dimensional information about the features within an image patch to serve as the basis for computing pose estimates (col. 6 lines 35-40).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Applicants' argue that Eibert relates to a three-dimensional vectors and that the claimed invention relates to two-dimensional vectors. However two-dimensional vectors are inherently included within the three-dimensional vectors of Eibert.

Regarding claim 8, Applicants' disclose that Burns teaches away from using an iterative match refinement technique. However, Burns merely states that the well-known

Art Unit: 2625

technique of iterative matching is not particularly effective, which does not teach away from using it. Furthermore, Burns states that iterative matching is potentially useful, thus providing motivation for using it.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns USPN 5,828,769 in view of Eibert et al. USPN 5,621,807 (hereinafter "Eibert").

Claim 1 discloses, "a method for creating a two dimensional geometric object model describing the geometry of an object for use in machine vision inspection, said method comprising: acquiring a pixel image representation of an object; generating a set of two-dimensional geometric part models of said object based on said pixel image representation, said two-dimensional geometric part models corresponding to different respective parts of said object, said two-dimensional geometric object model comprising said set of two-dimensional geometric part models; obtaining a test image containing the visual appearance of said object and a given known inspection measurement associated with the test image; performing test inspection on said test image using said two-dimensional geometric object model to produce a testing inspection measurement;

Art Unit: 2625

and retaining said two-dimensional geometric object model when said given testing inspection measurement deviates from said given known inspection measurement by an amount lower than a predetermined threshold."

Burns discloses a system visual recognition of an object under variations of three-dimensional position (col. 1 lines 16-19). Model images of an object are captured in digital form (col. 4 line 1) (acquiring a pixel image representation of an object) and multiple image patches are selected from each captured model image (col. 4 lines 2-3)(generating a set of part models). As can be seen in figures 4a-4c these patches or part models as well as the object model are two-dimensional. A current image (test image) is captured and patches are selected that contains information useful for determining a pose of the object (col. 4 lines 8-15)(given known inspection measurement associated with the test image). The current image patches are compared with the patches of the model (col. 4 lines 15-18) (performing test inspection on said test image). This is done to decide if the patches are similar (col. 4 lines 16-18). If the corresponding patches are similar a vote is counted(produce a testing inspection measurement), and the votes are used to decide if the current image is similar to the model within a threshold. If so it is then decided that the object has been recognized (col. 5 lines 64-67, continued to col. 6 lines 1-11). Burns does not explicitly disclose retaining the object model if the comparison is found to be sufficiently similar.

It is well known in the art to perform a comparison between a model and an image to determine whether or not to retain the model. Eibert discloses a system for the measurement of objects by means of an intelligent range imaging camera which

Art Unit: 2625

generates an image of an object in terms of the distance to points on its surface (col. 1 lines 9-12). A plurality of three-dimensional digital models of possible objects is stored in a data processor (col. 1 lines 48-49). Three-dimensional object geometry data acquired by the sensor are compared with one or more of the geometric models in order to identify the object as well as its position and spatial orientation (col. 1 lines 49-54). The geometric model is matched as well as possible with the range image data by a calculation (col. 3 lines 50-52) (25 figure 2). As seen in figure 2 if the calculation fails another model is selected from the database, and if it is successful the model is retained and classified as a good fit (retaining said object model when said given testing inspection measurement deviates from said given known inspection measurement by an amount lower than a predetermined threshold). Eibert further teaches that the advantages of the invention are that it can be used for zero contact object measurement, position and attitude determination, as well as object classification.

Burns and Eibert are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing comparing images to identify an object.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Burns with Eibert to recognize an object as specified by Burns and retain the model if it is found to be accurate as specified by Eibert. The motivation for doing so would be to classify the model as a good fit for the test image and allow for object measurement, position and attitude determination. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Burns with Eibert in order to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 5, Eibert discloses determining the measurement, position and attitude of an object (col. 1 lines 38-44). Furthermore Burns discloses providing sufficient dimensional information about the features within an image patch to serve as the basis for computing pose estimates (col. 6 lines 35-40).

Regarding claims 6-7, Eibert discloses that to determine the position and location three-dimensional vectors are used. As these vectors are three-dimensional they inherently contain two-dimensional information. These vectors determine the locations of object surface points in the coordinate system of the sensor (determining a coordinate system with respect to a specified reference)(col. 4 lines 41-45). The geometric model is then place with respect to the vector coordinate system (col. 4 lines 51-54).

Claim 8 discloses, "the method of claim 1, further comprising: refining one or more of said two-dimensional geometric part models; configuring a machine vision inspection tool based on said two-dimensional geometric object model; evaluating the performance of said two-dimensional geometric object model by evaluating testing inspection measurements in relation to known inspection measurements to produce an indication that said two-dimensional geometric object model is one of satisfactory and unsatisfactory; determining when said evaluating produces an indication of unsatisfactory, one or more causes that caused the unsatisfactory indication; and deciding an act to which to return for an iteration based on said cause, said act including said generating, said creating, said refining, and said configuring."

As discussed above the combination of Burns and Eibert discloses all of the limitations of claim 1. Burns teaches that it would be useful to use an iterative match refinement technique for improving a model after recognizing it (col. 3 lines 18-23)(refining one or more part models and deciding an act to which to return for an iteration based on said cause, said act including said generating, said creating, said refining, and said configuring). Eibert discloses configuring a computer to carry out machine vision inspection on an object(col. 3 lines 11-14)(configuring a machine vision tool based on said object model). As can be seen in figure 2 the performance of the geometric model is evaluated by matching as well as possible with the range image data by a calculation (col. 3 lines 50-52) (25 figure 2). If the model is determined unsatisfactory another model is selected from the database, and if it is successful the model is retained and classified as a good fit (evaluating the performance of said object model by evaluating testing inspection measurements in relation to known inspection measurements to produce an indication that said object model is one of satisfactory and unsatisfactory). The calculation determines the cause of the unsatisfactory condition.

Claim 9 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 1 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 9 are directed to a system. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 9.

Claim 13 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 5 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 13 are directed to a system. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 5 are equally applicable to claim 13.

Claims 14-15 disclose similar limitations to those discussed in claim 6-7 with the difference being that the limitations in claims 14-15 are directed to a system. Thus the same arguments discussed for claims 6-7 are equally applicable to claims 14-15.

Claim 16 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 8 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 16 are directed to a system. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 8 are equally applicable to claim 16.

Claim 17 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 1 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 17 are directed to a computer readable medium. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 17.

Claim 21 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 5 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 21 are directed to a computer readable medium. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 5 are equally applicable to claim 21.

Claims 22-23 disclose similar limitations to those discussed in claims 6-7 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 22-23 are directed to a computer readable medium. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 6-7 are equally applicable to claims 22-23.

Claim 24 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 8 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 24 are directed to a computer readable medium. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 24.

Art Unit: 2625

3. Claims 2-4, 10-12, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns USPN 5,828,769 in view of Eibert et al. USPN 5,621,807 (hereinafter "Eibert") and further in view of Shum et al. USPN 6,084,592 (hereinafter "Shum").

Claim 2 discloses, "the method of claim 1, further comprising: calibrating an image acquisition system to enable said acquiring to obtain calibrated said pixel image representation of said object; and specifying one or more constraints for said two-dimensional geometric object prior to said generating to provide additional information constraining said generating."

As discussed above the combination of Burns and Eibert disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Eibert further discloses calibrating the intelligent camera used for object measurement in order to eliminate systematic distance measurement errors (col. 2 lines 56-63).

The combination of Burns and Eibert does not explicitly disclose specifying constraints for said object prior to said generating to provide additional constraining information.

Shum discloses a method for the construction of three-dimensional models based on information or constraints provided (col. 1 lines 7-13, and col. 2 lines 30-31). Shum teaches that previous systems did not exploit important regularities present in the environment (col. 2 lines 32-34). Shum further discloses, "the structures associated with the manmade environment are full of regularities such as parallel lines...etc., which can be taken advantage of in the modeling process. Using these constraints, a fairly

Art Unit: 2625

complex 3D model can be constructed” (col. 2 lines 34-40). It should further be noted that Shum discloses, “the system and process of the present invention could also handle calibrated images as well” (col. 2 lines 22-23).

Burns, Eibert, and Shum are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of image processing using models.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Burns and Eibert to calibrate an image acquisition system. The motivation for doing so would be to allow for accurate measurements as is well known in the art. Furthermore it would have been obvious to further combine Shum to specify various constraints in order to take advantage of the regularities of the object in the modeling process. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Burns, Eibert, and Shum to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Shum discloses that the system employs all available geometric constraints and includes points, plane normals, line directions, plane distances, and parallel plane designations.

Claim 10 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 2 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 10 are directed to a system. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 2 are equally applicable to claim 10.

Claims 11-12 disclose similar limitations to those discussed in claims 3-4 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 11-12 are directed to a system. Thus the same arguments discussed for claims 3-4 are equally applicable to claims 11-12.

Art Unit: 2625

Claim 18 discloses similar limitations to those discussed in claim 2 with the difference being that the limitations in claim 18 are directed to a computer readable medium. Thus the same arguments discussed for claim 2 are equally applicable to claim 18.

Claims 19-20 disclose similar limitations to those discussed in claim 3-4 with the difference being that the limitations in claims 19-20 are directed to a computer readable medium. Thus the same arguments discussed for claims 3-4 are equally applicable to claims 19-20.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B Strege whose telephone number is (703) 305-

Art Unit: 2625

8679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between the hours of 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600